

City Council Special and Regular Meetings, May 22, 2001

Twin Pines Senior and Community Center, 1223 Ralston Avenue

**SPECIAL MEETING: TIME 5:45 P.M.**

**CLOSED SESSION**

A. Conference with Labor Negotiator, City Manager Kersnar, pursuant to Government Code Section No. 54957.6

1. MMCEA

2. AFSCME

3. BPOA

Attended by Council Members Cook, Wright, Rianda, Hahn, (Warden, absent), City Manager Kersnar, Human Resources Director Dolan, City Attorney Savaree, and Lee Finney, Industrial Employers and Distributors Association Representative. City Clerk Kern was excused from attending

**Adjournment** at this time being 6:25 P.M, this meeting was adjourned.

Kathy Kern

Belmont City Clerk

Meeting not tape-recorded.

**STUDY SESSION - 6:30 P.M.**

**Update on the proposed Ralston Village expansion project at 1333 Ralston Avenue.**

Principal Planner de Melo explained that the applicant was proposing a 159,040 sq. ft. four story independent senior living facility which would include a subterranean parking garage for 99 vehicles; 38 additional uncovered spaces located within the site. He reported that a 3,600 sq. ft. pool enclosure was also proposed for this development. Planner deMelo stated that this project was located on approximately 17 acres spread over three parcels, and the new construction was proposed on the four-acre vacant flat area. He noted that there was an 8-acre scenic easement on the back half of the site, which would not be disturbed. He explained that following preliminary design review, the applicant would submit an application for a conditional use permit (CUP) to amend the approved Detailed Development Plan for the site. He said amendments to the DDP require action by the Planning Commission only and Council comments would allow staff to work with the applicant to incorporate and address issues for future submittals.

**Mr. Liebeman**, Owner Ralston Village, 1333 Ralston Avenue, explained that he would like to create a progressive care facility at Ralston Village. He said Phase 1, the Alzheimer Facility was doing well

and he would now like to develop Phase 2 to complete this facility plan. He explained that this plan reflected the comments and ideas of the neighborhood outreach.

**Ms. Hathaway**, Hathaway Inc., Community Outreach, explained that they had developed this project using community value based design. She said they contacted the neighbors within 500 ft of Ralston Village and identified concerns about privacy, sight line, automobile and pedestrian traffic on Ralston Avenue, and preservation of the Oak trees on the property.

**Mr. Roos**, Project Manager, Pacific Union Development Co., used story boards to show the site plans for the graduated four story building, and showed that the tree canopy would cover most of this construction and screen it from Ralston Avenue. He said that after meetings with the neighbors, the project was reduced and pulled 100 ft. back from the hillside. He said that by siting the building in this location, they were able to preserve most of the oaks on the site. He explained that there would be very little tree removal on the site. Mr. Roos stated that the traffic study would address the egress and ingress concerns for traffic on Ralston Avenue.

**Mr. Cristofani**, Project Architect, TWM Architects & Planners showed the internal circulation that would separate the entries for the two facilities. He said one road would be 10 ft. below Ralston Avenue, and the other road would create an entry into a plaza area for outdoor use. He showed the 38 space open parking area, and the ramp down to the 99 car subterranean garage.

In response to C. Cook, Principal Planner de Melo explained that the Planning Commission would review this project twice: 1). Preliminary Design Review; and, 2). Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to amend the Detailed Development Plan. He said these amendments to the DDP require action by the Planning Commission only.

Community Development Director Ewing explained that staff would appreciate Council input on the underlying use, density, height, and basics about the project.

In response to C. Hahn, Principal Planner de Melo listed the limitations for the conservation easement, and noted that no expansion would take place within this area.

C. Wright asked Mr. Liebeman to explain the uniqueness of this proposed facility.

**Mr. Liebeman** explained that this was a full care facility, which would provide security to residents that there would be a full continuum of care available when needed.

In response to C. Hahn, the architects indicated that there were five homes on the West Side of the project. He said most of the homes were set back with heavy landscape screen.

C. Rianda suggested that a presentation be made to the Homeowner Association Presidents for input, because she thought the neighborhood was broader than the homes within the 500-ft. radius. She said she was in favor of this progressive care philosophy, but thought this project was too massive for this site. She said she was concerned about 137 new trips being generated in this congested area on Ralston Avenue. C. Rianda stated that she was not convinced that the easement was enhanced or protected with this project, and she did not think it was consistent with the type of development that existed in this area of Ralston Avenue.

C. Cook said that Ralston Avenue was a scenic corridor and she would not like to change the feel of that. She said this facility would be seen from many vantage points. She said she was concerned with the density because of the traffic it would generate on Ralston Avenue.

C. Wright stated he was in support of the proposed use because it was consistent with the current use. He said he was more comfortable with the massiveness of the facility now that he had seen the footprint and the site lines from Ralston Avenue. C. Wright said he had a high level of trust that this project would be built to the specifications on these drawings. He said he would also like the developer to continue outreach to the community. C. Wright said that he thought the addition of trees and landscaping would manage the mass issue regarding the building, and he was in support of the project.

C. Hahn said that she did not think that traffic from the facility would be a concern because she thought that elderly couples usually had one car, and most folks did not drive when they entered this type of facility. C. Hahn said she felt reassured that the massiveness of the facility was being addressed by siting the facility away from the scenic easement.

**Ms. Horton**, 1050 Chula Vista, stated her concern about the massive four-story building that would be viewed from her back yard. She said that the proposed tree screening would take years to be effective. Ms. Horton stated that this building was out of character for the community. She was also concerned about noise, lighting treatments and the ongoing maintenance of the creek. She said it was imperative that access be granted to the City for clean out, to prevent flooding of their property.

Adjournment at this time, being 7:30 P.M. this meeting was adjourned.

Kathy Kern

Belmont City Clerk

Meeting tape recorded and televised

### **REGULAR MEETING - 7:30 P.M.**

### **ROLL CALL**

COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT: Cook, Wright, Rianda, Hahn

COUNCILMEMBERS ABSENT: Warden

Staff Present: City Manager Kersnar, City Attorney Savaree, Community Development Director Ewing, Public Works Director Curtis, Finance Director Fil, Commander Wood, Human Resources Director Dolan, Principal Planner de Melo, IT Manager Harnish, City Clerk Kern

### **REPORT FROM CLOSED SESSION**

Mayor Hahn announced that direction was given, and no action taken.

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Pledge of Allegiance was led by the City Council.

### **SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY/PRESENTATIONS**

Presentation of Tranny Award from the California Transportation Foundation for Urban Conventional Highway Project - Railroad Grade Separations for the Cities of Belmont and San Carlos.

Mayor Hahn congratulated staff on receiving these awards for the Grade Separation project.

#### **Status Report on the City Hall/Police Facility Project.**

Direction was given at the Study Session to move this item to Agenda #8 so the architect could be present.

#### **PUBLIC/COUNCIL COMMENTS**

**Mr. Bauer**, 1027 Tahoe Drive, expressed his concern about the majority Council decision to table the Peninsula Jewish Community Center/Summerhill Project. He said that tabling this issue showed a lack of respect for the Developer, Planning Commission, staff and ultimately the future homeowners. He said with the exception of C. Cook and Wright, this Council made a poor decision on May 8<sup>th</sup>.

**Mr. Vanderslice**, 904 Hiller Street, said he did not think that the City was doing anything to protect his health and safety. He expressed concerns about the toxics that had leaked onto his property from the ARCO station across the street. He requested that Council shut the station down. He said he didn't think he had been provided all the documentation that he had requested, and would like all the documents produced for him.

Mr. Vanderslice refused to leave the podium after his time was up so the Mayor, on the advice of City Attorney Savaree, recessed the meeting.

Meeting recessed, at this time being 7:50 P.M.

Meeting resumed, at this time being 7:52 P.M.

**Ms. Della Santina**, 2704 St James Rd, former Planning Commission and Councilmember, expressed concern about the length of time it took to get building permits in Belmont. She listed projects that had been held up, and stated that ordinances were in place, and Professional Staff and Planning Commissioners were here to enhance the quality of life in Belmont. Ms. Della Santina stated that the citizens were very upset that the PJCC project had not been approved. She stated that affordable housing units were better placed near transit, not at this location. Ms. Della Santina stated that the community could not afford to sit by as a no growth community, because common sense improvements were needed. She stated that one of the Councilmembers that voted against this project could request that it be brought back for reconsideration. Ms. Della Santina urged Council to stay on course for Belmont's sake.

C Cook congratulated Mr. Metropulos for receiving Top Scot award from Carlmont High School. She explained that he was only the 3<sup>rd</sup> person in the history of the school to be given this honor.

C. Hahn expressed concern that citizens that may be Council candidates were using the Community Forum inappropriately.

#### **AGENDA AMENDMENTS**

Mayor Hahn announced that agenda item 1B (City Hall/Policy Facility Project) would be considered as agenda item #8.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

**Approval of meeting minutes:** Special and Regular Meetings April 24, 2001.

**Approval of Warrant List Dated:** May 4, 2001 in total amount of \$653,557.20 and dated May 11, 2001 in total amount of \$180,100.22.

**Written Communication** 1). Rec. from Varnum, Riddering, Schmidt & Howlett re. Model Cable TV Franchises, Cellular Tower Leases, Zoning ordinance; 2) Notice of application for a Gas and Electric Rate Increase: Annual Earnings Assessment Proceeding for PG&E; 3). Notice of Chapter 11 Bankruptcy Case, Meeting of Creditors, Special Procedures and Deadline for PG&E, Case No. 01-30923SFM.

**Motion** to approve Claims Management Report.

**Motion** to waive reading of Ordinances.

**Motion** calling for a public hearing on June 12 to consider the City of Belmont Budget for Fiscal Year 2001/2002.

**Resolution No. 8989** approving a Professional Services Agreement with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. for Radar Speed Surveys for an amount Not to Exceed \$16,500.

**Resolution No. 8990** approving award of contract to J.F. Pacific Liners, Inc. for the amount of \$497,22.00 for Basins 10, 13 and 15 Spot Repairs, City Contract No. 387.

**Resolution No. 8991** approving agreement with Carlmont High School for the rental of the Swimming Pool at Carlmont High School. (\$15,981)

**Resolution No. 8992** approving an agreement for the preparation of a Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for the proposed Extended Stay of America Hotel Development at 120 Sem Lane.

**Resolution No. 8993** approving an agreement for the preparation of traffic study for the proposed Extended Stay of America Hotel Development at 120 Sem Lane.

Consent Calendar adopted. Moved by C.Wright, seconded by C. Rianda, and approved unanimously, by roll call vote, with C. Warden absent.

### **PUBLIC/HEARINGS**

**Public Hearing** to consider an amendment to Section 9.23 (Grading) of the Belmont Municipal Code in reference to the threshold for the Planning Commission review of a Grading Plan. The amendment will consider reducing the threshold of Planning Commission review of a Grading Plan from five hundred (500) to two hundred and fifty (250) cubic yards of excavated and filled material. Applic. No. 2000-1015, CEQ Status: Exempt: Exempt (CEQA Guidelines-Section

**15308) City of Belmont (Applicant).** Principal Planner de Melo explained that this amendment would reduce the threshold for Planning Commission review from five hundred to two hundred and fifty cubic yards of excavated and filled material. He explained that this amendment would address changes to grading quantity calculations that occur during submission of final grading plans to the City. Principal Planner de Melo stated that staff had developed zone text language that would assure adherence to the grading goals and objectives when significant changes were made to the grading quantity calculations.

Community Development Director Ewing explained that he and Public Works Director Curtis had concurred that they need to work on coordination of a more comprehensive global review of this process in the near future.

Mayor Hahn opened the public hearing.

On motion by C. Rianda, seconded by C. Wright to close the public hearing.

C. Wright stated that the Council and Planning Commission had agreed that a more integrated view should be taken instead of incremental solutions. He suggested that this item be tabled until a process had been developed by staff.

C. Cook stated that she thought the Planning Commissioners input should be considered when looking at this process. Comments to consider: 1). Decide whether we are attempting to control grading, or control development; and, 2). the possibilities of allowing more cut and fill to provide greater stability of the land. C. Cook agreed that a more integrated approach would be beneficial.

In response to C. Rianda, Community Development Director Ewing reported that he thought this was one of the most important projects for Planning, and he would be reviewing other city ordinances that included comprehensive site plans and design review processes. He said he would have a matrix prepared listing the various findings, purpose and control mechanisms, and hoped to find a positive approach to determine good projects. Community Development Director Ewing stated that he thought the Council and the Planning Commission would need a couple of study sessions in the next few months to review this material.

Community Development Director Ewing stated that approval of this grading amendment would not have changed the project on San Juan Blvd, it would only cause smaller projects to have to be heard by the Planning Commission.

In response to C. Cook, Community Development Director Ewing stated that he would be looking at the same criteria as before, but answering the questions: "how does this project protect contours, reduce bulk, and provide compatibility in a positive way". The applicant will have the ability to show how they balanced all the issues for the site. Community Development Director Ewing said this process would be more comprehensive than the current design review.

**Action:** on motion by C. Rianda, seconded by C. Wright, and approved unanimously, by show of hands, 4-0 (Warden, abs.) to table this item for further review.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **Proposed Budget Review.**

### **Update regarding Proposed Service Delivery Initiative. (Mr. Lewcock, Lewcock Group)**

Finance Director Fil explained that these presentations would be conducted by various speakers. He explained that no action would be taken at this meeting.

**Mr. Lewcock**, Lewcock Group, explained that the five objectives of the Proposed Service Delivery Initiative were:

To assist the City Council in making more informed resource allocation decisions.

To assist staff to more sharply focus on the services desired and to serve as the foundation for continuous improvement.

To enhance periodic monitoring and reporting.

To conform to emerging GASB recommendations and possible requirements.

To provide for a flexible and expandable "Architecture".

Mr. Lewcock indicated that this approach would answer three critical questions for the Council.

- 1). Why service was being provided?.
- 2). The means used to provide service.
- 3). How well service is provided, or how much service is being provided.

Mr. Lewcock used a sample form for the Service Area Measures and Performance and explained how the purpose, measures and activities determined the overall performance in different areas and thus the funding to achieve the results. He stated that this strategic approach would provide a tool to improve service delivery in every department on a day to day basis.

In response to C. Cook, Mr. Lewcock stated that over time, this day to day process becomes consistent and the employees realize that this is a living program. Periodic reporting to the Council will enhance the day to day focus on quality service.

C. Wright stated he fully supported this concept and was committed to a process that would take time to integrate into the system. He said one of the things that was most significant to him, was alignment of the Executive Management staff, which included the Council members.

Mr. Lewcock explained that the most intensive training time will be over the next 11/2 years, and after that the improvement should be endless.

C. Rianda said it was exciting to be working toward the next phase of the budget process, which would allow us to present a professional way to provide customer service to the community.

C. Cook said she saw two direct results from this process; accountability, and empowerment of staff to provide service the best way possible.

City Manager Kersnar stated that with Council concurrence, he would bring back a Professional Services Agreement for Mr. Lewcock at the next meeting, to get this process started.

**Master Fee Schedule (Mr. Wakefield, DMG-Maximus)**

**Mr. Wakefield** DMG Maximus, reviewed the project scope, which included 1). calculation of full cost of service; 2).comparison of cost to fee schedule; 3).comparison of fee schedule to neighboring cities; and, 4). recommended fee adjustments. He stated that this analysis was done to develop accurate management information, and make recommendations on current and potential fees. Mr. Wakefield reported that following this fee study, they made recommendations to decrease fees for some of the Police functions. He reported that the City was currently subsidizing fees by \$1.5 million, and the current cost recovery rate was 55%. He said with all of the fee increase recommendations; it would bring the rate up to 69%.

City Manager Kersnar stated that the fee schedule would be considered at a public hearing in June, and Council could make recommendations at that time.

In response to C. Cook, Mr. Wakefield stated that they did not analyze quality or efficiency in any of the departments, they were making recommendations based on service provided. Their goal was to make the departments cost neutral, in other words, no subsidies.

### **Financial Policies**

Finance Director Fil reviewed the Financial Policies, which provide staff guidance on financial management practices for: 1). Accounting, Auditing and Financial Reporting; 2). Cash Management; 3).Budgeting and Financial Management; 3). Debt Management; 4) Retirement and benefits Administration; 5). Risk Management; and, 6). Procurement Management. He explained that the Level One Policies could only be amended or deleted by Council action, and Level Two Policies could be acted on by staff. Finance Director Fil reported that there were a few key policy issues to focus on, which included: 1). Investment Policy; 2). Reserve Policy; 3). Contingency Appropriation; 4). Community Group Operational and Project Funding; and, 5). Purchase Orders and Contracts. He said these policies require regular updating to include new or modified recommended practices and could be reviewed on the City Website. He explained that these policies would be included in the FY 2002 budget for adoption.

### **Budget Review Schedule**

Finance Director Fil reviewed the Budget schedule with Council and explained the process for the Budget Public Hearings in June.

City Manager Kersnar explained that the staff had put together an Executive Summary that would be mailed to Homeowner Presidents and Commissioners. This information would also be put on the Website. City Manager Kersnar stated the he would be setting up meetings with Councilmembers to answer their concerns before the Budget Public Hearing.

### **ORDINANCE AND RESOLUTION REGARDING FEE SCHEDULE FOR ENCROACHMENTS**

Consideration of adoption of Ordinance amending Article 1, Section 22-4-Encroachments. (2<sup>nd</sup> reading and adoption) and Consideration of Resolution approving a Fee to remove a Stop Work Notice for work requiring an Encroachment Permit.

Public Works Director Curtis explained that this was the second reading of the Ordinance, and the Resolution would be incorporated into the Master Fee Schedule to be adopted in June.



**Action:** On motion by C. Wright, seconded by C. Cook and approved unanimously, by show of hands, with C. Warden absent, to adopt:

**Ordinance No. 961** amending Article 1, Section 22-4, Streets and Highways Encroachments.

**Action:** On motion by C. Wright, seconded by C. Cook and approved unanimously, by show of hands, with C. Warden absent, to adopt:

**Resolution No. 8994** - Resolution approving a Fee to remove a Stop Work Notice for work requiring an Encroachment Permit.

## **NEW BUSINESS -**

### **Overview of reengineering for One Stop Permitting.**

Community Development Director Ewing reviewed the scope of work that he would like to include in the Request For Proposals. He stated that the values and objectives that were fundamental to this process included Customer Service; Increased Productivity; and Improved Documentation. He requested that if Council had input, that they e-mail comments to him, so this process could move forward.

In response to C. Wright, Community Development Director Ewing stated that he hoped to introduce out this new process when the new counter was open for business.

Community Development Director Ewing noted that along with the Council workshops and meetings, he would like to hold a workshop for the customers, to hear their comments and concerns about experiences at the counter.

C. Rianda stated that the coordination between the departments was paramount for the applicant, and she was glad to see that this was going to be addressed.

## **BOARD, COMMISSION, COMMITTEE UPDATES, AND STAFF REPORTS**

**Mr. Hunter**, Architect, EKONA read a letter stating that the architect would have the City Hall/Policy Facility drawings ready by June 25<sup>th</sup>.

Staff stated they would put this on the June 26<sup>th</sup> agenda to adopt a bid date.

Staff stated they would provide an updated schedule for Council.

**ADJOURNMENT** at this time, being 10:10 P.M. this meeting was adjourned.

Kathy Kern

Belmont City Clerk

**Meeting Tape Recorded and Televised**

Tape No. 497